

said reflected light comprises infrared light,
 said imaging device receives said reflected light and translates said reflected
 light into an electronic signal,
 said electronic signal is a video signal for the production of images of said
 object.

REMARKS

In sections 1 the Examiner noted that the applicants assertion that "the apparatus taught and claimed by Vincent is for 'determining the color composition' of a part of an object and not for identification of the object itself" might be true but noted that the recitation "identification of the object" has not been given patentable weight because it appeared in the preamble of the claims.

In sections 2 and 3 the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 on the grounds of double patenting. Applicants have submitted herewith a terminal disclaimer along with the appropriate fee to overcome the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 3. Applicants therefore submit that claims 2 and 3 are now in condition for acceptance and requests that the Examiner accepts claims 2 and 3.

In section 4, the Examiner objected to the format of claim 4. Claim 4 has been reformatted to overcome the objection of the Examiner.

In sections 5 and 6, the Examiner rejected claims 2-14 under 34 USC 102 as being anticipated by Vincent. In particular, in the third paragraph on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the electronic signal of Vincent "is a video signal of the production of images of said object" and refers to col. 1, lines 21-22 as "implying a video signal of the production images of the object". Applicants reassert their previous submission that unlike Vincent, which is specifically interested in the color of an object or part of an object, the applicant's invention is not concerned with color. Applicants further reassert that the application is for identification of the object itself, not for identification of

110